1			
2			
3			
4			
5	PEEOD		
6	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY		
7	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
8		G N 0655	
9	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 3677	
10			
11	1820 S. California St.	DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER	
12		[Gov. Code, §11520]	
13	26977	·	
14	D		
15	Respondent.		
16			
17	FINDINGS OF FACT		
18	1. On or about November 9, 2011, Complainant Virginia Herold, in her official capacity		
19	as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs (Board),		
20	filed Accusation No. 3677 against Neeracha Jeensngar (Respondent) before the Board of		
21	Pharmacy. (Accusation attached as Exhibit A.)		
22	2. On or about September 1, 1998, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy Technician		
23	Registration No. TCH 26977 to Respondent. The Pharmacy Technician Registration was in full		
24	force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 3677 and expired		
25	on November 30, 2011, and has not been renewed. "This lapse in licensure, however, pursuant to		
26	Business and Professions Code section 118(b) and/or agency-specific statute does not deprive the		
27	[Board] of its authority to institute or continue this disciplinary proceeding."		
28	///		
	1		

- 3. On or about November 21, 2011, Respondent was served by Certified and First Class Mail copies of the Accusation No. 3677, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and Discovery Statutes (Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7) at Respondent's address of record which, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4100, is required to be reported and maintained with the Board. Respondent's address of record was and is: 1820 S. California St., San Gabriel, CA 91776.
- 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c) and/or Business & Professions Code section 124.
- 5. On or about November 22, 2011, the aforementioned documents were returned by the U.S. Postal Service marked "Unclaimed." The address on the documents was the same as the address on file with the Board. Respondent failed to maintain an updated address with the Board and the Board has made attempts to serve the Respondent at the address on file. Respondent has not made herself available for service and therefore, has not availed herself of her right to file a notice of defense and appear at hearing.
 - 6. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:
 - (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing.
- 7. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon her of the Accusation, and therefore waived her right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. 3677.
 - 8. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:
 - (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent.
- 9. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on the relevant evidence contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this matter, as well as

taking official notice of all the investigatory reports, exhibits and statements contained therein on file at the Board's offices regarding the allegations contained in Accusation No. 3677, finds that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 3677, are separately and severally, found to be true and correct by clear and convincing evidence.

10. Taking official notice of its own internal records, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3, it is hereby determined that the reasonable costs for Investigation and Enforcement is \$5,000.00 as of August 17, 2012.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

- 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Neeracha Jeensngar has subjected her Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 26977 to discipline.
 - 2. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.
- 3. The Board of Pharmacy is authorized to revoke Respondent's Pharmacy Technician Registration based upon the following violations alleged in the Accusation which are supported by the evidence contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this case:

Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under sections 490 and 4301, subdivision (l), of the Code, in conjunction with California Code of Regulation, title 16, section 1770, in that Respondent was convicted of crimes substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensed pharmacy technician, as follows:

- a. On or about February 15, 2008, after pleading guilty, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Penal Code section 459 [second degree commercial burglary], and one misdemeanor count of violating Penal Code section 476 [forgery], in the criminal proceeding entitled People of the State of California v. Neeracha Jeensngar (Super. Ct. Los Angeles County, 2008, No. 7RI05933). Respondent was sentenced to 30 days in jail, ordered to pay a fine and placed on formal probation for a period of 36 months with terms and conditions.
- b. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about September 18, 2007, Los Angeles Sheriff's Department deputies responded to a "Bank of the West" branch regarding an individual (Respondent) who was attempting to cash ten \$500 denomination fictitious traveler's checks and deposit a check in the amount of twenty three thousand five

1	hundred dollars and no cents (\$23,500) into her personal account. When the deputies approached		
2	Respondent and asked her what she was doing at the bank, she responded that she was there to		
3	make a deposit for her "work." Respondent stated to the deputies that she had recently started		
4	working for a company based in Canada as bookkeeper and that the company would send her		
5	checks which she was to deposit into her personal banking account. Once the checks cleared, she		
6	was to take ten percent of the total as her fee and then wire the balance back to the company in		
7	Canada. When asked by the deputies if she believed that the checks that she was depositing coul		
8	have been fictitious, Respondent replied that she "thought they could be fake, but [she] needed		
9	the money."		
10	<u>ORDER</u>		
11	IT IS SO ORDERED that Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 26977, heretofore		
12	issued to Respondent Neeracha Jeensngar, is revoked.		
13	Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a		
14	written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within		
15	seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may		
16	vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.		
17	This Decision shall become effective on November 26, 2012.		
18	It is so ORDERED ON October 25, 2012		
19	BOARD OF PHARMACY		
20	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
21			
22	La C. Wussi		
23	By STANLEY C. WEISSER		
24	STANLEY C. WEISSER Board President		
25			
26	51123427.DOC DOJ Matter ID:LA2010501810		
27 28	Attachment: Exhibit A: Accusation		

Exhibit A

Accusation

KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California MARC D. GREENBAUM Supervising Deputy Attorney General KIMBERLEY J. BAKER-GUILLEMET Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 242920 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2533 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804 Attorneys for Complainant		
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
In the Matter of the Accusation Against: NEERACHA JEENSNGAR 1820 S. California St. San Gabriel, CA 91776	Case No. 3677 ACCUSATION	
Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 26977 Respondent.		
Complainant alleges:	THES	
 Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs. On or about September 1, 1998, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy Technician Registration Number TCH 26977 to Neeracha Jeensngar (Respondent). The Pharmacy Technician Registration was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on November 30, 2011, unless renewed. 		
	Attorney General of California MARC D. GREENBAUM Supervising Deputy Attorney General KIMBERLEY J. BAKER-GUILLEMET Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 242920 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2533 Facsimile: (213) 897-2504 Attorneys for Complainant BEFOR BOARD OF I DEPARTMENT OF C STATE OF C In the Matter of the Accusation Against: NEERACHA JEENSNGAR 1820 S. California St. San Gabriel, CA 91776 Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 26977 Respondent. Complainant alleges: PART 1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmac 2. On or about September 1, 1998, the E Registration Number TCH 26977 to Neeracha Jec Technician Registration was in full force and effetherein and will expire on November 30, 2011, un ///	

 $/\!/\!/$

 $/\!/\!/$

///

///

JURISDICTION

3. This Accusation is brought before the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

- 4. Section 118, subdivision (b), of the Code provides that the suspension, expiration, surrender or cancellation of a license shall not deprive the Board, Registrar or Director of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.
 - 5. Section 490 of the Code states:
- "(a) In addition to any other action that a board is permitted to take against a licensee, a board may suspend or revoke a license on the ground that the licensee has been convicted of a crime, if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued.
- "(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a board may exercise any authority to discipline a licensee for conviction of a crime that is independent of the authority granted under subdivision (a) only if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the licensee's license was issued.
- "(c) A conviction within the meaning of this section means a plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere. Any action that a board is permitted to take following the establishment of a conviction may be taken when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal, or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code."

(commencing with Section 801) of Title 21 of the United States Code regulating controlled substances or of a violation of the statutes of this state regulating controlled substances or dangerous drugs shall be conclusive evidence of unprofessional conduct. In all other cases, the record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence only of the fact that the conviction occurred. The board may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime, in order to fix the degree of discipline or, in the case of a conviction not involving controlled substances or dangerous drugs, to determine if the conviction is of an offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a licensee under this chapter. A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this provision. The board may take action when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing the person to withdraw his or her plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, information, or indictment.

. . . .

"(o) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the violation of or conspiring to violate any provision or term of this chapter or of the applicable federal and state laws and regulations governing pharmacy, including regulations established by the board or by any other state or federal regulatory agency."

REGULATORY PROVISION

8. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, states:

"For the purpose of denial, suspension, or revocation of a personal or facility license pursuant to Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475) of the Business and Professions Code, a crime or act shall be considered substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensee or registrant if to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of a licensee or registrant to perform the functions authorized by his license or registration in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare."

COST RECOVERY

9. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board, Registrar or Director may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Substantially Related Criminal Conviction)

- 10. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under sections 490 and 4301, subdivision (l), of the Code, in conjunction with California Code of Regulation, title 16, section 1770, in that Respondent was convicted of crimes substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensed pharmacy technician, as follows:
- a. On or about February 15, 2008, after pleading guilty, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Penal Code section 459 [second degree commercial burglary], and one misdemeanor count of violating Penal Code section 476 [forgery], in the criminal proceeding entitled *People of the State of California v. Neeracha Jeensngar* (Super. Ct. Los Angeles County, 2008, No. 7RI05933). Respondent was sentenced to 30 days in jail, ordered to pay a fine and placed on formal probation for a period of 36 months with terms and conditions.
- b. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about September 18, 2007, Los Angeles Sheriff's Department deputies responded to a "Bank of the West" branch regarding an individual (Respondent) who was attempting to cash ten \$500 denomination fictitious traveler's checks and deposit a check in the amount of twenty three thousand five hundred dollars and no cents (\$23,500) into her personal account. When the deputies approached Respondent and asked her what she was doing at the bank, she responded that she was there to make a deposit for her "work." Respondent stated to the deputies that she had recently started working for a company based in Canada as bookkeeper and that the company would send her checks which she was to deposit into her personal banking account. Once the checks cleared, she was to take ten percent of the total as her fee and then wire the balance back to the company in Canada. When asked by the deputies if she believed that the checks that she was depositing could

have been fictitious, Respondent replied that she "thought they could be fake, but [she] needed 1 the money." 2 SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE 3 (Act Involving Moral Turpitude, Dishonesty, Fraud, Deceit or Corruption) 4 Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4301, subdivision (f) of the 5 Code in that she engaged in an act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, deceit and/or 6 corruption. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the allegations set forth in 7 paragraph 10, subparagraphs (a) and (b), as though set forth fully. 8 9 THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE 10 (Unprofessional Conduct) Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4301 of the Code in that 12. 11 she violated laws and/or regulations governing pharmacy. Complainant refers to, and by this 12 reference incorporates, the allegations set forth in paragraph 10, subparagraphs (a) and (b), as though 13 14 set forth fully. III15 16 /// /// 17 111 18 /// 19 20 /// 21 /// /// 22 /// 23 /// 24 25 /// H26 27 /// $/\!/\!/$ 28

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Board of Pharmacy issue a decision:

- 1. Revoking or suspending Pharmacy Technician Registration Number TCH 26977, issued to Neeracha Jeensngar;
- 2. Ordering Neeracha Jeensngar to pay the Board of Pharmacy the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3; and
 - 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

VIRGINIA HEROLD Executive Officer Board of Pharmacy

Department of Consumer Affairs

State of California
Complainant

LA2010501810 60680972.doc